

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on February 1, 2006.

No claims are amended, claims 8-25 were previously canceled, without prejudice to the Applicants; as a result, claims 1-7 and 26-38 are now pending in this application.

Replacement Drawings

Corrected drawings were supplied with Applicants' last Office Action Response. Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner indicate in the next Official Action that the drawings were accepted by the Examiner. There is no indication that the drawings are still being objected to; therefore Applicants assume that the drawings are now in order and in the proper format desired by the Examiner.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-7 and 26-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quine et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0115280) in view of Schneider (U.S. 6,901,436). It is of course fundamental that in order to sustain an obviousness rejection that each and every element in the rejected claims must be taught or suggested in the proposed combination of references. Moreover, there must be some motivation to combine the references in the manner proposed by the Examiner.

The Schneider reference is directed to up selling domain registrations to potential registrants. To do this, Schneider attempts to match identifiers in one domain to additional domains and if an identifier is not available across domains, Schneider attempts to find similar identifiers across multiple domains to sell those similar identifiers.

Conversely, the Quine reference is directed to correction mechanisms for email addressing errors. As was stated in the prior response of record, the Quine reference does not discuss or deal with multiple domains. Quine addresses solving or mapping email prefix errors to a proper email account and Schneider is directed to suggesting identifiers for multiple domains for domain registration.

Applicants respectfully fail to see how a prefix email address editor of Quine when combined with a domain and identifier suggestion mechanism of Schneider would yield the missing teaching of defining a single address for multiple formats and multiple domains. The specific reference in Schneider cited for the missing teaching discusses mapping fictitious or non real domains to a single domain. Applicants submit that this is not additional domains, this is the same domain associated with non real or fictitious other domains. Thus, a fictitious domain cannot be “one or more additional domains” because as defined and used it is either a fake domain or pursuant to the teachings of Schneider the same domain; but it is not an “additional domain.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Quine and Schneider in the manners suggested by the Examiner without having first read and comprehended Applicants’ invention, which is improper hindsight and which is impermissible.

Additionally, Schneider completely lacks any notion of a preferred domain. That is, in Schneider there are multiple domains for an identifier or multiple domains for different but similar domains. There is no concept or teaching of a preferred domain vis-à-vis other domains. Moreover, even if the Examiner includes the teachings of Schneider with Quine the proposed combination would lack the preferred domain teaching entirely. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections cannot stand if the proposed combination still lacks each and every limitation or suggestion of every limitation that is included in the Applicants’ claims. There is no notion of providing a heavier weight or emphasis via a “preferred” domain teaching on a particular domain vis-à-vis another “additional” domain in Schneider. Thus, even assuming the combination is proper and is made with motivation of one of ordinary skill in the art, the combination still lacks a teaching of a “preferred domain” vis-à-vis one or more additional domains.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections in view of two considerations. First, the proposed combination is not proper since it is not reasonable to assume one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the references together. Second, even if the combination is made it still lacks a teaching or suggestion of a “preferred” domain limitation vis-à-vis “one or more additional” domains.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.116 – EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Serial Number: 10/099,789

Filing Date: March 15, 2002

Title: METHODS, SYSTEMS AND DATA STRUCTURES FOR ELECTRONIC ADDRESSING

Page 7

Dkt: 1565.008US1

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

A. KENT SIEVERS ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(513) 942-0224

Date

04/03/06

By

Joseph P. Mehrle

Joseph P. Mehrle
Reg. No. 45,535

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 3 day of April, 2006.

Peter Rebutroni

Name

Peter Rebutroni

Signature